

REMARKS

This is a response to the supplemental Office Action dated June 24, 2009 which was issued at Applicants' request to clarify that the pending rejection is not a final rejection. Since the supplemental Office Action was issued at Applicants' request within one month of the Office Action dated June 18, 2009, the statutory period for response to the supplemental Office Action ends June 24, 2009.

Claims 1-19 were pending in the above-identified application when last examined. Claims 1-10 were withdrawn from consideration as a result of a prior restriction requirement and are now canceled. Claim 15 is amended to correct a grammatical error, and claims 20-25 are added.

Claims 11-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,716,101 (Meadows) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,115,819 (Anderson). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 11 distinguishes over the combination of Meadows and Anderson at least by reciting, "apparatus for retrieving information relating to trusted computing platforms located within said pre-determined geographical area."

Meadows is directed to systems and methods for using a wireless communications network such as a cellular telephone network to determine the location of an individual and report the location via a communication systems such as the world wide web. Meadows nowhere mentions or suggests trusted computing platforms.

Anderson discloses a secure computer architecture.

Applicants request clarification regarding the basis for this rejection. Applicants particularly request an identification of which elements or features described in Meadows are believed to correspond to or suggest the access point recited in claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action on beginning with the last paragraph of page 2 and continuing on page 3 provides a detail summary of Meadows. However, Applicants are still uncertain with regard to whether the access point is being compared to one or more cell towers, the entire wireless network 11, database 14 or 15, http server 16, or some combination of these elements. Applicants are also uncertain regarding how the "pre-determined geographical area" recited in claim 1 is being identified with geographical areas in Meadows. For example, Meadows

refers to areas containing locations that are closest to a specific cell tower and also describes locating individuals within an entire wireless network. Applicants submit that these details are necessary to enable Applicants to more fully respond to the rejection.

As noted by the Examiner, Meadows is silent on the capability of communicating with trusted computing platforms. Anderson is cited for teaching trusted computing platforms, and the Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Meadows “for monitoring geographical location and movement” of trusted computing platforms. However, Meadows teaches tracking the locations of mobile devices, particularly cell phones that are kept on the persons of individuals. Meadows tracks cell phones to determine the location of individuals, not because any information relating to the cell phone is of interest. Meadows and Anderson fail to suggest that people would be keeping trusted computing platforms on their person so that tracking would be useful. In short, the combination of Meadows and Anderson does not provide a reason or need for tracking the locations of trusted computing platforms, and no such reason is provided in the Office Action. Without some reason or motivation for combining Meadows and Anderson, it would not have been obvious to combine Meadows and Anderson as the Examiner suggests.

In accordance with an aspect of Applicants’ invention, a person with a portable computing device can use an access point such as recited in claim 1 to identify and use trusted computing platforms available in a geographical area. Neither Meadows nor Anderson address or suggest the issue of obtaining information relating to trusted computing platforms in a geographical area. Further, Meadows is non-analogous art to the field of trusted computing platforms. In particular, one of skill in the art in the field of trusted computing, such as recited in claim 1 and as addressed in Anderson, would not look to Meadows to solve a problem in the field of trusted computing platforms. Meadows is directed to cell phone technology and locating of individuals, so that it would not have been obvious for one of skill in the art to combine the non-analogous art of Meadows with the technology of Anderson to solve a problem for trusted computing platforms. Claim 1 is thus patentable over the combination of Meadows and Anderson.

Claims 12-19 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Meadows and Anderson for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over Meadows and Anderson.

Claim 12 further distinguishes over Meadows and Anderson by reciting, “said information system is arranged to provide as said information only details and/or a list of

public keys of genuine trusted computing platforms within said pre-determined geographical area.” In regard to claim 12, the Examiner cites col. 5, lines 13-29 of Meadows. The cited portion of Meadows refers to the table illustrated in Meadows’ Fig. 3, which is part of a geographical location database. Applicants assume that the Examiner refers to this portion of Meadows for describing, “The fields in the exemplary table of information includes, for example, an authorized user access code.” However, the authorized user access code is simply a password, and Meadows provides no suggestion of “public keys,” which are well known for encryption. Further, claim 12 recites “only details and/or a list of public keys of genuine trusted computing platforms.” Meadows fails to suggest restricting information or lists to those associated with only “genuine trusted computing platforms” particularly because Meadows is silent with regard to trusted computing platforms.

Claim 15 further distinguishes over Meadows and Anderson by reciting, “said apparatus for communicating or interacting with a user’s portable computing apparatus is arranged to perform said communication or interaction by physical contact or directional wireless communication.” In regard to claim 15, the Office Action cites Meadows col. 5, lines 30-47, but the cited portion of Meadows describes how a user can access location data, particularly over the Internet. The cited portion of Meadows fails to describe or suggest either access through physical contact or through directional wireless communication.

Claim 16 further distinguishes over Meadows and Anderson by reciting, “a declaration concerning the trustworthiness of the system,” which is not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Meadows and Anderson.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 20-25 are added. New claim 20 depends from claim 11 and is patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 11 is patentable. New independent claim 21 is patentable at least for reciting, “retrieving to the information access point information relating to trusted computing platforms within the geographical area,” which is not disclosed or suggested by the cited reference. Claims 22-25 depend from claim 21 and are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is patentable.

In summary, claims 1-19 were pending in the application. This response amends claim 15, cancels claims 1-10, and adds claims 20-25. For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application including claims 11-25.

Please contact the undersigned attorney at (530) 621-4545 if there are any questions concerning the application or this document.

Respectfully submitted,

/David Millers 37396/

David Millers
Reg. No. 37,396